

proposals, Prof L.B. Holthuis noted (BZN 57: 45-46) that it would be advisable to select a lectotype for *C. rathkii*.

I have recently received on loan the *Diastylis rathkii* material from ZMUC. It is a single specimen, an ovigerous female from the Kattegat with the accession no. ZMUC-CRU-7936. The loan paperwork states the specimen to be the 'holotype' and it is apparently the only one now remaining of the original type series.

Băcescu (1992) referred to the two type localities for *D. rathkii* and wrote of the Copenhagen material as 'syntypes', but had not seen or examined the type material (L.B. Holthuis, in litt., September 2001). It is not possible to ascertain at what point during the 160 intervening years the rest of Krøyer's (1841) material was lost.

I confirm that the Copenhagen syntype is a specimen of *Diastylis rathkii* as currently understood. Since it is possible that the original material, from two widely separated localities, may have belonged to more than one taxon, to secure the identity of the nominal species *D. rathkii* I now designate specimen ZMUC-CRU-7936 as the lectotype.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Hydroporus discretus* Fairmaire & Brisout in Fairmaire, 1859 (Insecta, Coleoptera)
(Case 3147; see BZN 58: 105-107)

Philippe Bouchet

Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 55 Rue de Buffon, F-75005 Paris, France

The application seeks to conserve the name *Hydroporus discretus* Fairmaire & Brisout, 1859 by suppressing the name *H. neuter* Fairmaire & Laboulbène, 1854. The senior synonym has been used as valid once after 1899, which excludes the case from the reversal of precedence covered by Article 23.9 of the Code. The application (para. 8) gives four references to works published in the last 50 years that have used the name *discretus* and states that a further 16 references have been given to the Commission Secretariat. My examination of this list of additional references shows that only three have been published in the last 50 years. In my view the applicant has not demonstrated that a name so infrequently used as *Hydroporus discretus* Fairmaire & Brisout, 1859 needs conservation, and priority should apply.

Comment on the proposed precedence of NYMPHULINAE Duponchel, 1845 over ACENTROPINAE Stephens, 1835 (Insecta, Lepidoptera)
(Case 3048; see BZN 56: 31-33; 57: 46-48)

David Agassiz

Department of Entomology, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

I very much support Dr Solis's application for the conservation of the family-group name NYMPHULINAE Duponchel, 1845 by giving it precedence over ACENTROPINAE Stephens, 1835.

I believe Speidel (1981, 1984) was correct in synonymising the subfamilies NYMPHULINAE and ACENTROPINAE, and ACENTROPINAE is the older name. However, my understanding, even before the greater emphasis given to usage in the latest (4th) edition of the Code, is that it is important to preserve a name that is in general use.